

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

- Claims 1-6 are pending in the Application.
- Claims 1-6 stand rejected by the Examiner.
- Claims 1-6 are currently amended.

### **Specification Objections**

The specification is objected to for referring to claims in paragraphs 0008, 0010, 0012, 0014, and 0016. Applicant has amended the specification to remove references to the claims. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the specification objection.

### **Drawing Objections**

The Examiner objects to the drawings to for failure to show the information processing means of claims 1, 2, and 5. Applicant respectfully traverses the objection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the information processing means is shown in Figure 3 as CPU 202 and is specifically referred to in paragraph 0034. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

### **Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant amends Claim 1 original line 7 to more clearly identify which “means” is invoked. Original line 10 is amended to reference “object” with an indefinite article to resolve the antecedent basis uncertainty. Original line 10 is amended to change “may be” to “is” to resolve uncertainty. Original line 20 is amended to reference “icon” with an indefinite article to resolve the antecedent basis uncertainty.

Applicant amends Claim 2 original line 5 to more clearly identify which “means” is invoked. Original line 11 is amended to reference “icon” with an indefinite article to resolve the antecedent basis uncertainty.

Applicant amends Claim 5 original line 3 to remove the word “or” and to clearly define which “means” is invoked.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments address the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claims 1-6.

### **Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-3, 5, 13-23, 32-39, and 41-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated over US. Patent No. 6,938,079 to Anderson et al. (Anderson). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Anderson discloses a system and method for automatically configuring a client device. Anderson teaches:

“In one exemplary embodiment, a user of a client device selects a service provider such as an Internet Service Provider from a plurality of service providers that conform to an automatic configuration process. ...Further, the client device formats the user's information data to a predetermined data structure, such as an XML data structure, and a predetermined data format that is employed by the service provider selected by the user. Then, the client device establishes a communication session with the service provider selected by the user. ...When the client device accesses the service provider, it sends the formatted user's information data to the service provider. ...Further, when the service provider receives the user's information data, the service provider validates the data structure and the format of the received data and based on the user's information data, it provides configuration data to the client device. ...Further, when the client device receives the configuration data from the service provider selected by the user, the client device configures internal application such as a network dial-up application and provides data such as login information data to the user.” (col. 7, line 51- col. 8 line 16)

The Office action dated 9/11/2006 on page 4 states (in relevant part):

“Regarding Claim 1, Anderson discloses a content administration system for administering content, comprising:

- (1) content administration information storage means (420) for storing individual content administration information for every item (e.g. ISPs) of user identification information (See Col. 44, 37-67);
- (2) icon image storage means (Icons directory. Col. 39, lines 7-8) for storing icon images;”

(Office Action, page 4)

Applicant submits that Anderson teaches that the memory 420, analogized to the content administration system information storage means of Claim 1, resides in the client device. Applicant notes that Anderson Figure 8, which depicts memory 420, is described by Anderson as:

“FIG. 8 is a functional block diagram illustrating an example of a client system architecture for the client device of the present invention” (col. 8, lines 60-62).

Also, the Anderson reference to an “Icons directory” in col. 39, lines 7-8 is used by the thin process 560. The thin process 560 is a process that resides in the client as well. Anderson teaches:

“Architecture 500 also includes a thin server process 560, which is a server process residing in the client device rather than a remote server, that accesses a template store 562 and an Extended Markup Language (XML) database 564.” (col. 15, lines 29-32).

Amended Claim 1 states, in relevant part:

“A content administration system server for administering content, the system server comprising:

- (1) content administration information storage means for storing individual content administration information for every item of user identification information;
- (2) icon image storage means for storing icon images;

(3) communicating means for communicating with an external terminal device via the Internet; and...”

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 addresses a content administration system server and the system server comprises (1) content administration information storage means, (2) icon image storage means, and (3) communicating means for communicating with an external terminal device. Applicant respectfully submits that the content administration system server, and not the external terminal device (client), includes the information storage means and the icon image storage means according to the elements of amended Claim 1. Anderson teaches that the memory 420 and the Icon directory are specifically included in the client device. Thus, Anderson fails to disclose a content administration system server having elements (1) content administration information storage means, and (2) icon image storage means as recited in amended Claim 1.

Applicant notes that amended independent Claims 2 and 5 also explicitly indicate that the icon storage means is an element of the content administration server and not the client device. Anderson teaches that the icon directory is associated with the thin process 560 which is part of the client rather than a remote server (col. 15, lines 29-32). Thus, Anderson fails to disclose at least the icon storage means of the content administration system server as recited in amended independent Claims 2 and 5.

Also, in general, Applicant notes that, overall, the process of Anderson as stated in the Summary section of columns 7-8 is a method where a user of a client device selects a service provider such as an Internet Service Provider from a plurality of service providers that conform to an automatic configuration process. The method includes the client device querying the user for user information data such as user's location data, a username, a user's e-mail address or credit information data. Then, the client device formats the user's information data to a predetermined data structure, such as an XML data structure, and a predetermined data format that is employed by the service provider selected by the user. Then, the client device establishes a communication session with the service provider selected by the user. The client device establishes the communication session with a predetermined server of the service provider. When the client device accesses the service provider, it sends the formatted user's information data to the service provider. The client

device then sends the user's information data as an XML data stream having a plurality of DTDs associated with the user's information data. Then, when the service provider receives the user's information data, the service provider validates the data structure and the format of the received data and based on the user's information data, it provides configuration data to the client device. Then, when the client device receives the configuration data from the service provider selected by the user, the client device configures internal application such as a network dial-up application and provides data such as login information data to the user.

Applicant respectfully submits that the method of Anderson is different than the method of Claim 1 which includes receiving of user identification information from the terminal device via the Internet, specifying content administration information storage means corresponding to the received user identification information, acquiring object path information correlated to the sharing permission information from content administration information storage means of another unspecified user, acquiring an icon image from the icon image storage means, making display control information for the content administration screen containing the an icon image leading to the object based on the acquired icon image and the object path information previously acquired, and transmitting the made display control information to the terminal device via the Internet.

Thus, Applicant concludes that both the methods and the structure of Anderson differ from those of the pending claims. Since Anderson fails to disclose a content administration system server that includes a content administration storage means and an icon storage means and since the processes performed by Anderson differ substantially from the pending claims, then Anderson cannot anticipate the pending claims because all elements are not disclosed in the reference.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of independent Claims 1-6 because not all elements are present in the cited art and thus the pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

**DOCKET NO.:** SHIO-0011  
**Application No.:** 10/807,735  
**Office Action Dated:** 9/11/2006

**PATENT**

**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in a condition for allowance upon entry of the amendments herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 28, 2006

/Jerome G. Schaefer/  
Jerome G. Schaefer  
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439